

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated September 7, 2007, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on December 7, 2007. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-30 remain pending in the application and are shown above. Claims 12-30 stand withdrawn by the Examiner and are canceled by Applicant in this response. Claims 1-11 are finally rejected by the Examiner. Reconsideration of the rejected claims is requested for reasons presented below.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 and 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mayer et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,537,416) in view of *Anderson et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,851,041). Claims 2, 3-5 and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mayer et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,537,416) in view of *Anderson et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,851,041) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of *Adachi et al.* (U.S. Publ. No. 2002/0134212). Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mayer et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,537,416) in view of *Anderson et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,851,041) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of *Kurihara et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,820,685).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

With regard to claim 1, the Examiner asserts that *Mayer et al.* teach a substrate bevel cleaner with a movable dispensing nozzle capable of dispensing a cleaning fluid. The Examiner further asserts that *Anderson et al.* teach a wafer holder attached to a spin/dry system having a housing holding the system. The Examiner asserts that *Anderson et al.* teach a rotatable substrate support and the use of four cooperatively rotatable substrate centering posts that remain stationary with respect to the support member (fig. 2, part 215, col. 4, lines 20-54) to facilitate cleaning of the wafer.

Applicant submits that the Examiner errs in construing claim 1 of the present application.

The Examiner asserts that the “centering posts” of *Anderson et al.* remain stationary with respect to the support member (emphasis added) while rotating with the support member. Applicant submits that the Examiner adds language that does not comport with reasonable construction of the claim at issue. Claim 1 of the present invention recites that at least three cooperatively rotatable substrate centering posts are radially positioned around the rotatable substrate support member such that the posts remain stationary during rotation of the substrate support member. Both the plain language of the claim and the detailed description given in the specification support construing the language of the claim to exclude centering posts that remain stationary with respect to the support member while rotating with the support member (Fig. 4, [0049]-[0051]).

Anderson et al. teach a wafer holder (200) mounted on a spindle assembly (201) having L-shaped members (215) that pivot to hold a wafer in place during rotation (Fig. 2, Col. 4, lines 20-54). Although it is not clear which components of *Anderson et al.* the Examiner correlates to a “rotatable substrate support” and “four cooperatively rotatable substrate centering posts,” it is clear that when the spindle assembly (201) rotates the wafer holder (200), L-shaped members (215) as well as all other wafer holder components move along with the wafer holder (200) and can not remain stationary as recited in claim 1 of the present invention.

Therefore, *Mayer et al.* and *Anderson et al.*, alone or in combination, fail to teach, show or suggest a substrate bevel cleaning chamber comprising a chamber body defining a processing volume, a rotatable substrate support member positioned in a lower portion of the processing volume, at least three cooperatively rotatable substrate centering posts radially positioned around the rotatable substrate support member such that the posts remain stationary during rotation of the substrate support member, and a fluid dispensing nozzle movably positioned to dispense a cleaning fluid onto the top surface of a substrate positioned on the substrate support member as recited in claim 1 and claims 2-11 dependant thereon.

In conclusion, the references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the invention as claimed.

The secondary references made of record are noted. However, it is believed that the secondary references are no more pertinent to the Applicant's disclosure than the primary references cited in the office action. Therefore, Applicant believes that a detailed discussion of the secondary references is not necessary for a full and complete response to this office action.

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Keith M. Tackett
Registration No. 32,008
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant(s)